

(MR. SPEAKER)

Sri H. V. Pataskar in identically the same terms. When Sri Pataskar's turn was reached he stated :

“Sir, in view of the amendment moved by Mr. Santhanam, I do not propose to move mine.”

On the 27th of August 1947 there was an amendment in the name of Sri P. S. Deshmukh. This Hon'ble Member read out his amendment, made a short speech and at the end of it he stated :

“Sir, I know that the sentiments I express and the socialistic bias that I would like this Constitution to have is not very popular in the House as it is constituted to-day. Under the circumstances I merely wish to make these observations for the consideration of the framers of the Constitution. I have no desire to move my amendment.”

These authorities are enough to show that what happened on Saturday in the this House, was nothing out of the way or irregular or out of order. Normally when a resolution or motion stands in the name of a Member and if he does not want to move it, it is but proper that he should confine himself to a mere statement to that effect. This is because any other speech or statement would, to that extent, take away the time of the House to no purpose. Any discussion or Debate that takes place in the House must be directed towards a motion which is before the House and in respect of which a decision of the House is expected. Unless the Debate or a statement or a speech is directed towards ascertainment of the views of the House on any motion before it, the time taken would be fruitless. While this is a general statement, occasions may necessitate short statements or remarks which cannot be said to transgress any of the Rules of Procedure. On the particular occasion which gave rise to this point of order, the Hon'ble Member merely expressed an expectation that the Government would consider his resolution sympathetically or favourably.

There is nothing objectionable in this statement and there is no substance in the point of order raised.

Member's Representation.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA (Sira).—May I just draw your attention to rule 40? Rule 40 says: “The Government shall send a reply to a question for oral answer within fifteen days...” I tabled my question in March 1962. No answer I have been able to get. Another thing. In the Budget Session, 1963 I tabled a short notice question. It was converted into an ordinary question...

Mr. SPEAKER.—I don't convert; I say it may be taken as a starred question.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—We are in the sixth month. No reply was furnished to that short notice question. I want to know what is the procedure adopted by the Legislature Secretariat in getting replies from Government?

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member please come and meet me in my Chamber.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Because the Chief Minister is here, he can direct the other Ministers to get replies.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member may go on arguing. I am not allowing that.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—If I am not permitted to bring to your notice what the rules say...

Mr. SPEAKER.—But not now unless it is included in the agenda.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—It is not possible. When we want to bring certain things to your notice...

Mr. SPEAKER.—Does the Member think that bringing to my notice here is the only method?

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Sir, you have repeatedly requested the Government and the Chief Minister also has held out a promise to this House that replies would be furnished as early as possible. That is why, I am making this request. My short notice question has not seen the light of day.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will consider it very seriously. (laughter)

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—I do not know how much seriousness you are going to bestow, Sir. (laughter)

Mr. SPEAKER.—All the doubts that the member has, need not be expressed; he must keep them for himself. I would make a personal request to all the Members that if they have got anything, they must tell me; otherwise, they will be disturbing the whole trend of the discussion.

MYSORE DRAMATIC PERFORMANCES BILL, 1963.

Motion to (consider.—Continued).

† **Sri S. M. KRISHNA (Maddur).**—Sir, yesterday I was submitting to the House that the renaissance of the Kannada stage had been initiated in Bangalore. As many as three dramatic companies have been drawing a large number of people to witness the dramas that are being enacted. After all is said and done, this is an area in which the Government should be interested in trying to patronise these dramatic troupes. No doubt, people of this State are willing to encourage the Kannada stage; they are willing to encourage Kannada art. Sir, all of us are aware that this Kannada stage is fighting against odds. Kannada stage can by no means be equated with an industry. It is not an industry in the sense in which we term films. All of us know that film industry is one of the most flourishing industries in our country. Kannada stage